

1  
2  
3  
4 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
67  
8 DELPHINE ALLEN, et al.,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,

12 Defendants.  
13MASTER CASE FILE  
NO. C00-4599 TEHORDER RE: TECHNICAL  
ASSISTANCE

14 At the May 4, 2010 status conference, the Court “order[ed] the parties to meet and  
15 confer with the monitor to determine how best to utilize the monitor’s technical assistance in  
16 developing a plan to move forward, including any contract modifications that may be  
17 necessary to ensure reasonable compensation to the monitor.” May 4, 2010 Rep. Tr. at  
18 7:14-18. The Court acknowledged the City’s financial concerns but expressed its view that  
19 using the Monitor for technical assistance “will save money in the long run. . . . If the City  
20 only has discussions with the monitor during the quarterly site visits, I believe it will be  
21 extremely difficult, if not impossible, for this case to end in two years.” *Id.*


22 The Court has been informed by the Monitor that, three weeks after the Court’s order,  
23 an agreement on technical assistance has yet to be reached. As the Court explained at the  
24 most recent status conference, time is of the essence, and the City can afford no more delay if  
25 it wishes to end this Court’s oversight by the January 2012 expiration of the current  
26 memorandum of understanding.

27 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties and the Monitor shall meet  
28 and confer and reach a financial agreement on technical assistance on or before **June 4,**

1 **2010.** The Court may issue an order to show cause if no agreement has been reached by that  
2 date.

3  
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5  
6 Dated: 05/27/10

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT